From the Yeast of the Pharisees (Come the Lies & Crimes of Zionism)

Part One: The Aristocrats of the World

GREG MAYBURY
SEP 30, 2021

48 24 15 Share

> *From the Yeast of the Pharisees (Come the Lies & Crimes of Zionism): Part Two — The Unholy Grail of Israel.*

From the Yeast of the Pharisees (Come the Lies & Crimes of Zionism): Part Three — The Terrible Power of the Purse.

From the Yeast of the Pharisees (Come the Lies & Crimes of Zionism): Part Four — The Children of the Corrupted Covenant

From the Yeast of the Pharisees (Come the Lies & Crimes of Zionism): Part Five — The Nightmare of the Never-ending Nakba

Notice to my readers: To support my work, please consider becoming a paid subscriber, or even a one-off financial contributor. Doesn't have to be a lot. All donations gratefully accepted. See below for details of direct payments. Or subscribe via the Substack page.

🗣 '*The world of the national imaginary has always taken, for us, the form of a long recital. Legends, great deeds, and the particular myths of tribes, religious communities, and kingdoms were transformed into a long, continuous narrative of imaginary peoples who had supposedly existed since the dawn of time. Misty and fragmentary images served as fictional foundations for a mythological temporal continuum, flowing since the birth of the nation.*' — **Shlomo Sand, Jewish historian, author, *How I stopped being a Jew*, 2014.**

'*Be careful...watch out for the yeast of the Pharisees...*' — **Jesus Christ, 'King of the Jews'**, giving his disciples a 'heads up'. (Mark 8:15)

***Preamble**: As is so often the case, one can't escape the sense of déjà vu attending conversations about any and all things Israel. Such debate is invariably attended by musings on its kinship with its chief benefactor—and midwife—the United States. The events in the Middle East this year alone once again bring this into sharp relief, with most of America's political classes and its establishment media in familiar lock-step avoiding any criticism of the Tel Aviv regime. Sadly, it was ever thus.*

> *Though especially evident since 9/11—an historical climacteric from which Israel appears to have been the only state that has benefitted and which continues to do so—this unholy, toxic 'alliance' is the decades-in-the-making basis for everything we've recently witnessed, with links to pretty much all we're experiencing in the here and now. Whilst such links remain, so do the existential dangers for America's own national interest and that of the rest of the world.*
>
> *In this first instalment in a series of stand-alone articles,* ***Greg Maybury*** *draws upon the work of both Jewish and non-Jewish writers, researchers, analysts and historians to present a critical, wide-ranging exploration of various facets of the mythos and the reality of Israel, its history, and its origins. Along with that, he attempts an in-depth probe into Zionism and its own genesis, and especially that of the inordinate power its various supporters, lobby groups, apologists and defenders have wielded—and continue to do so—across time and space.*
>
> *For the uninitiated, Zionism is the reigning political ideology which inspired the establishment of the Jewish State in 1948 and which since that epochal turning point, still dictates its national interests, such as they are. And it is an ideology that has compromised, if not indeed usurped, the "national interests" of the nations in which so many of "God's chosen" reside.*
>
> *Moreover, it is one whose tenets are arguably the most enduring, portentous, globally consequential, yet least understood—by Jews and non-Jews alike—of any of the major political currents in the 'river of our history'. Time then for another visit to the Wailing Wall, albeit one of a different kind!*

— Hell hath no Fury like an Infuriated Jewry

In steeling oneself for another excursion into *farbotn teritorye*—that is, proffering critical analyses of "the Middle East's only democracy", to say nothing of impugning the conduct and behaviour of "God's Chosen"—one has to read far and

wide, with deep dives into the Memory Hole *de rigueur*. In the nethermost regions of that fabled repository of lies, sins and crimes of our collective historical consciousness, one soon becomes aware that in the section marked "Israel", it's standing room only.

That said, the dearth of space has more to do with the amount of information shoehorned in there, than it does with the number of researchers queuing up at any given time to locate some hitherto little noticed, perhaps as yet unearthed, morsel of truth about this troublesome nation and its dominant tribe. Such is the hidden backstory of what Israeli historian **Ilan Pappe** calls *"fantasy Israel"*.

More to the point, the more diligent students of history who dare to explore the terrain therein must tread warily, lest they find something which compels them to reveal said "morsel" to the rest of the world. This if for no other reason than 'hell hath no fury like an infuriated Jewry' (as it were). Meaning? Our 'Hebrew' brethren aren't known for their tolerance in having their dirty linen aired in the public square.

Nonetheless, many intrepid explorers past and present—and both Jewish and non-Jewish—have still undertaken that "deep dive", something for which we should all be forever grateful. Though their reputations and careers at the time might have suffered for their troubles, at least for more objective observers their legacies have stood the test of time, and their warnings impressively prescient. We'll showcase a few of these folks' work throughout our narrative.

In no particular order of priority, one such individual was **Douglas Reed**. For many years the chief European political correspondent for the London Times up until around 1938, Reed then took a new career turn as an independent journalist, author and what we now call a revisionist historian. By embarking on his own journey into that forbidden territory, we might say though he went 'off the reservation'. It's uncertain if he was fully aware at the time of the reputational implications of doing so; it is this writer's guess though that the career limiting

blowback for Reed did not come as a complete surprise. (Much the same as it did later with David Irving, whose work we shall examine in future instalments.)

In musing on ***The Controversy of Zion***, the man's masterful account of the history of the Jews and Judaism from antiquity to the modern era, it's difficult to think of many books that might so transform one's thinking about our common history in the West. As the title suggests, this is especially so in the context of examining said history through the prism of the outsized role played by our 'Hebrew' brethren in human affairs.

And at the same time, Reed's narrative—completed even as it was in 1956, incidentally just shortly after the pivotal **Suez Crisis**—brings so many more recent events and developments into a more coherent historical context, and a sharper geopolitical perspective. Put another way, to coin a phrase Reed was 'on the shekel'.

Along with providing us a deep deliberation on the forces which have shaped it, and which, over forty-six years after its publication, continue to shape it today, Reed's opus presents us a wholly unsettling—indeed shocking—exposition of the current state of our world and how we reached this point in human affairs. To the extent my own knowledge and understanding permits, I can't think of too many observers who so comprehensively, authoritatively, and eloquently bore witness to his times, and intuited the long-term portent for humanity of the events he reported on. Such an epiphany for this writer at least, is all the more profound now with the passage of time.

Written between the years 1949-1956 (for reasons which may already be clear to some, it remained unpublished until 1978, about two years after his death), Reed's book chronicling what he calls the "Grand Design", delivers a prescient—and by its very subject matter, *controversial*—account of the current global order and its principal architects, their unerring ingenuity, their resilience and determination, and their expansive influence and reach.

The “architects” in this case are what we now call ***Zionists***, principally Jews (or at least purporting to be “Jewish”, a point to which we’ll return in this and later instalments), and most definitely who claim bragging rights to speak on behalf—and act in the interests—of their notional tribal brethren across the diaspora. Reed depicts unsparingly the machinations and motives of the people who were crucial in bringing said “design” to fruition, and the means by which these aims and ambitions as originally devised were to be achieved.

As we’ll see in this and follow up articles, whilst attainment of some of these objectives is still a work in progress, there has been considerable progress made in the interim. This is an observation that with the application of some basic hindsight—and an appropriate presence of mind—may already be clear to the more clued up students of history and contemporary world affairs.

That said, such is the very nature and dynamism past and present of the principal protagonists in this narrative, we can expect there’ll be a good many surprises awaiting us going forward in the course of our journey. Few though I expect will detract from—or contradict—the premise upon which this series is based. If anything, events yet to take place will continue to underscore that premise as outlined, short of which is a collective awakening upon the part of humanity as to the existential dangers facing us all.

The following extract perhaps sets out Reed’s ‘stall’ best; as per the above preamble, it further provides us an appropriate segue into what follows, later on in *this,* and again in subsequent instalments. It should also provide a pointer to what is likely to be a key recurring theme of the series: that of Israel’s legitimacy as a nation; in fact, its very right to exist, and what its ongoing ‘existence’ portends for humanity.

Reed gives us a strong hint herein. After declaring that [T]he use of the name "Israel" by the Zionist state created in Palestine [in 1948]...**is ‘*in the nature of a forgery’,*** he added:

> *'Some strong reason must have dictated the use of the name of a people who were not Jews and would have none of the creed which has become Judaism. One tenable theory suggests itself.* ***The Zionist state was set up with the connivance of the great nations of the West,*** *which is also the area of Christendom. The calculation may have been that these peoples would be comforted in their consciences if they could be led to believe...they were fulfilling Biblical prophecy and God's promise to "Israel",* ***at whatever cost in the "destruction" of innocent peoples...****If that was the motive for the misuse of the name "Israel", the expedient may for the time being have been successful; the multitude was ever easily "persuaded". However, truth will out in the long run...****If the Zionist state of 1948 could lay claim to any name whatever taken from far antiquity, this could only be "Judah****".'* [Emphasis added.]

Of all the numerous frauds and forgeries perpetrated in the lead up to—and beyond—modern Israel's creation, this is perhaps our first port of call in reaching a deeper understanding of the Zionist Project, its attendant psychopathologies and pretensions, and same of those who've so fervently subscribed to it.

Though we'll continue to explore Reed's proposition more in future instalments, suffice to say the implications of the above observation alone are astounding. This, without factoring in the author's premise *"[the] truth will out in the long run"* (whilst being mindful this was penned around seventy years ago). Such a prediction calls into question what sort of time frame Reed envisioned for that "truth" to emerge. Put another way, for all intents and purposes, that "truth" remains as elusive now —albeit hidden in plain sight for many—as it was back in Reed's heyday.

Further, it is the *connexion*—or symbiotic relationship—to which Reed draws our attention between the "left", (ostensibly represented by **Communism**, **Bolshevism** or **Marxism** et. al.), and the Jewish, Zionist, and/or 'Israelite' elite castes, along with their Gentile collaborators (all comprising the much derided billionaire cum oligarch classes, "Great Resetters", "New Normalites", and globalist new-worlders), that mark out his book as unique. This, at this point in our history, and notwithstanding its vintage, renders his narrative very much *au courant*.

For those folks in particular who're still mired in the nominally disparate, yet tedious, dogmas, mantras and slogans that characterise the left versus right political dichotomy and the discourse that tags along with it, such statements may not be obvious or for that matter easily explained; yet they are as wide and as deep and as real as they are insidious and subversive. The overarching debate concerning Israel and its place in the world, and the role the "Chosen Ones" have played therein—a key premise upon which this series is based—is a reflection of my conviction here.

When it comes to Israel especially (though hardly exclusively), the manifest bankruptcy and fraudulence of the left versus right (liberal v conservative, revolutionary v reactionary) paradigm is brought into ever sharper relief. This reality is another of the paradoxes which are a central feature of the Zionist project (and as we'll continue to explore later, very much a contrivance of Zionism's ideological forbears, going back at least as far as the **French Revolution**).

Moreover, there's a supreme logic to it all, as those "diligent students" will discover when they imbibe the main thrust of Reed's own bespoke 'book of revelations'. For if his interpretation of the history of human affairs is in any way accurate, then his exposition of the "Grand Design" and its architects is a book which unveils an unholy deception therein, on a scale that might leave the Devil himself green with envy if he were not its begetter. For those who don't believe in the latter's existence, then said "deception" may be seen as being of more temporal origin.

All of which is to say, it does not require a big leap in logical extrapolation to go from Reed's "Grand Design" to the WEF's "Great Reset". Even if one does not subscribe to notions of Biblically derived determinism or for that matter even believe in a higher deity, we are dealing with forces that are inherently "evil", at least insofar as most folks might define something as evil. Again, that "evil" may be seen as a *temporal* or a *spiritual* evil, depending on one's beliefs.

— *The Unseen Architects (Behind the Grand Design)*

After positing that all nations, *'...are founded on acts of violence, which are then forgotten...',* the French historian and philosopher **Ernest Renan** further surmised that *'forgetfulness, and historical error, are essential in [their creation]'*.

With the possible exception of its chief benefactor, patron, and minder, by Renan's summation, few countries would 'pass muster' in this regard more decisively than Israel. Its creation was built on myth making, terror, malice, falsehood, and violence of the highest order, and its longevity has been sustained by more of the same and then some. That it still does today is evident for all but the most myopic of history's students and partisan of pundits.

Yet we might go further and say that with Israel, there's been more calculation than "error", though it certainly has made more than its share of the latter. At all events, whether via calculation, miscalculation and/or "errors", they've been much more costly for others than for Israel. Put simply, Israel's "errors" are rarely condemned, much less punished. They get away with murder and much, much more, and much worse. This is perhaps something we might say the Israelis and the die-hard Zionists themselves—along with their 'tribal brethren' in the broader diaspora—have been both mindful of, if not thankful for!

Though doubtless, so many folks aren't. "Mindful" that is. Nor "thankful". This includes especially the citizens of the United States, where the cost to them of the sponsorship of this tiny nation in blood, treasure, geopolitical goodwill, and its own national interest—to say little of its moral capital and international prestige—has been immeasurable, perhaps incomprehensible for many. And a "cost" that judging by all the evidence available to us, is irredeemable. A sunk cost as it were, albeit one of a material and a political—perhaps also even an *existential*—kind.

The United States in short—and the West generally, including my own country Australia—has picked up the tab for Israel's bad behaviour! The return for all on the 'investment' is at best, dubious; at its worst, ruinous! And existentially so! The well-documented débâcles of Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, and Syria alone are clear evidence of this. The law of diminishing returns has always been applicable in the US-Israeli relationship. Now never more so obvious, at least for those folks with an eye to these things.

And though the aforesaid Renan goes on to say that 'revealing unwanted truths' can 'endanger nationhood', to the extent that there are such risks involved, then in Israel's case this may not be such a bad thing. As with individuals thinking rationally before acting, in principle at least there's nothing like a bit of existential danger—real, not imagined—to elicit from nations more prudent behaviour in order to avoid blowback from any reckless great power plays. That's the theory at least.

In *practice* of course, for Israel that may be another matter altogether. As one **Colonel Lawrence Wilkerson** recently observed, after positing that Israel may not exist within 20 years, because it is *'delegitimising itself as an apartheid state',* the former **Colin Powell** *aide-de-camp* went further: *'Israel is a "strategic liability of the first order" for the United States and is the most likely state in the world to take the United States to Armageddon.'* It is safe to say Wilkerson had the aforementioned "débâcles" front of mind when he proffered this cogent, albeit unsettling, analysis.

Now aside from the fact that Israel and its American friends likely took a dim view of the Colonel's remarks, the mention of [the] "United States", "Israel", and "Armageddon", in a single mouthful should give us pause for some serious reflection. This not to mention suggesting that Israel's shelf-life may now be short-lived. Others still might take issue only with Wilkerson's use of the present tense, i.e. "*delegitimising*".

> *Author Note: Which brings to mind here the infamous "**Samson Option**", as revealed by the Jewish-American journalist **Seymour Hersh**, in a book of the same name. More on Hersh's work in future instalments. Suffice it to say, more than one Israeli leader has suggested that if Israel is threatened existentially, it won't hesitate taking the rest of the world down with it using its formidable arsenal of nuclear weapons.*

At all events, even if one is optimistic about Israel's demise short of the advent of the Apocalypse, as its history has brought home to us all, it is quite capable of doing a lot of damage in the interim even without nukes. In the case of Israel then, the more people who know about the ideology which inspired its creation and underpins its *raison d'être*, its origins as a nation, its trajectory since then, and its geopolitical ambition going forward, the better off we'll all be. Forewarned is forearmed as the saying goes!

Again I stress, by necessity this should include Israel's own citizens and their brethren in the diaspora; far too many have chosen to imbibe the reigning political narrative—its *mythos*—over a starker, less romanticised, more authentic reality. One that is in sync with and simpatico towards the rest of humanity. That is, one in lieu of, and an antidote to, the "national imaginary" so defined by **Shlomo Sand** in the epigraph. Remaining ignorant of, or sanguine about, the implications of continuing to embrace the "mythos" is no longer an option. For

Jews *and* non-Jews alike. Wilkerson's observations above should be enough to enlighten us on that score.

But Wilkerson is not alone, a point to which this and succeeding instalments will attempt to reveal.

And so it is we proceed with a deeper exploration of some of the above considerations, and maybe take a few steps further. At this point, it is perhaps best to begin by asking exactly "*what is a Jew*?" Or more precisely, what does it mean to be one? 'Defining' a *Muslim* or a *Christian* is to be sure, the less daunting task. Answering the former question however is akin to playing 'pin the tail on the donkey'. To the best of this writer's knowledge, beyond the proscribed, though hardly adequate 'textbook' matrilineal parameters, no-one—Jew or non-Jew—has ever accurately or satisfactorily defined what being Jewish is.

For this writer (a humble Gentile), being Jewish has always been at its core about *religion* (i.e. Judaism), not race. Though they might forever remain incomplete, my own research undertakings and efforts at arriving at a clearer insight on this question haven't disabused me of this long-held view.

Be that as it may, **Adam Weisberger** (in discussing the work of 'pioneer' Zionist **Moses Hess**, to whom we shall also return in a future instalment), for his part noted that *'in modernity the Jews again slip through the grasp of Gentile attempts to comprehend them. Are the Jews a race, a nation, or a religion?...modern Gentiles and Jews asked.'* The answer he said, '*depended upon the interest of who was asking.*' It's as if being a Jew can mean precisely what anyone—that is, those proclaiming 'Jewishness' and those inclined to defend them—wants it to mean!

Now if this sounds like a refrain plucked out of *Alice in Wonderland*, then that's perhaps not coincidental! Weisberger is far from being the only one to ponder this Carrollesque conundrum. For his part, *'fixing Jewishness'*, noted **Phillip Weiss**, '*is a futile exercise'*; it is perhaps these and other questions—and the dearth of clear

answers—which brought him, Weisberger and others pondering the quandary to such head-scratching conclusions, such as we might be able to define them so.

Perhaps a question many might be inclined to ask here is this: "*Why does being a Jew have to be so 'complicated*'". It's difficult to accept that said complexities surrounding the definitions of what is a Jew have not been purposefully obfuscated in their contrivance. To what end we might only speculate at this point. And how then do we define a "good Jew"?...a wholly new kettle of gefilte fish as it were.

Moreover, what's with the "Chosen People" thing? Is there any other more dangerous delusion which has infected the human mind throughout our history, whether it is embraced by those who see themselves as part of the Tribe itself, or others (i.e. Gentiles, especially so called Christian Zionists and their ilk) who unabashedly indulge their "chosen" delusions. By the logical necessity implicit in the premise of this series we'll explore these questions more deeply in future segments.

On Patrol—The World's Most Moral Army™ packing its right to defend itself and its nation.

— An Exclusive Club of the Elect (Who the Real Jews Are)

In a 2014 newspaper article **Shlomo Sand**, the dissident Israeli historian, anti-Zionist, and by his own account something of a *rehabbed* Jew, expressed unambiguous sentiments regarding his purported ethnic-cultural identity and why he made the decision to 'divorce' himself from his brethren.

For the iconoclastic author (another of the Tribe's 'self-loathing' myth-busters), having become he says, *'painfully aware that I've undergone an adherence to Israel, been assimilated by law into a fictitious ethnos of persecutors and their supporters',* and having *'appeared in the world as one of the exclusive club of the elect...'*, it was time, Sand averred, to withdraw from that "club". To pull the pin as it were.

Yet even in the process of relinquishing his "Jewish" status, here Sand seemed to stop short of actually defining what a Jew is. Are they defined by ethnicity, or are

they some arcane tribal grouping or cultural entity the character or essence of which we Gentiles (aka "goyim") are never likely to grasp, if indeed we're ever actually meant to? Are modern day Jews in fact *Semitic* peoples, complete with authentic blood or genealogical ties to at least one of the twelve tribes of Israel, themselves the leading drivers of the epic, enthralling (if not always historically tenable), Biblical narrative?

Well, yes and no. Some are apparently, some are not! In reality most aren't of course. And if not, then what do we make of the whole notion of "anti-Semitism", and of the epithet, *"[you're an] anti-Semite"*? This is again another question to which we shall return again in future instalments.

And for that matter, why do so few people talk about 'anti-Gentilism' (or more precisely "**loxism**")? One only needs a passing familiarity with the basic tenets of the **Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*** or of the Jewish **Talmud** (again, both of which more later) to realise such animus towards those not considered to be card-carrying members of the tribe is *more than equal* to—indeed far surpasses that of—any form of discrimination that attends expressions of "anti-Semitism".

The truth of the matter is that the vast majority of those who proclaim "Jewish" blood, genes or familial and/cultural heritage today are not—repeat not—of

Semitic or Middle Eastern origin! Here again, grand implications abound given the frequent use of the "anti-Semite" epithet alone.

This retort—what Reed aptly called the "anti-Semitic rebuke"—is perhaps the most powerful offensive *and* defensive weapon those purporting to be Jews and/or acting in the interests of "real" Jews have had at their disposal in constructing their "Grand Design", or for the purposes of obscuring their real attitudes towards non-Jews and their larger goals, motives and ambitions. Yet it holds the dubious distinction of being one of the greatest anomalies (or perhaps more aptly put, *contradictions*) attendant upon the Jewish *mythos*, one rarely mentioned, must less challenged, except mainly by fools rushing in and the occasional angel treading in uncharted terrain. Then again, we might say that by definition, such myths are inviolable, not meant to be challenged.

And when it comes to the number and variety of anomalies on offer which attend modern Israel's "mythos", that is a big call by any measure.

So embedded is this fabled construct in our collective consciousness even now, and so effective and enduring has been the "forgery", it's difficult for folks to embrace any new reality or insight that might contradict the contradiction as it were, much less the implications of the contradiction itself. This, regardless of the overwhelming evidence to the contrary, which has been well documented, albeit far from common knowledge, for decades. (Perhaps what we're up against here is something akin to what's called the "Paradigm Effect".)

In future instalments, we'll explore further just who the real Jews are. Suffice to say though there was and remains a 'thirteenth tribe', as anyone familiar with the work of another disenchanted Zionist **Arthur Koestler** will be aware. His book called "The Thirteenth Tribe" seeks to lifts the veil on this myth. Others of course, including the aforesaid Sand have done same. But to no avail it would seem: The myth still stands; unlike say the **Temple of Jerusalem**, it remains seemingly indestructible.

Said the aforesaid Sand: *'I wish to resign and cease considering myself a Jew…',* clearly aware that in doing so he was not going to endear himself to 'the Tribe', yet at the same time knocking into a cocked hat the notion of *'once a Jew, always a Jew'*.

He became conscious moreover,

> '*…of living in one of the most racist societies in the western world. Racism is present to some degree everywhere,* ***but in Israel it exists deep within the spirit of the laws****. It is taught in schools and colleges, spread in the media, and above all and most dreadful, in Israel the racists do not know what they are doing and, because of this,* ***feel in no way obliged to apologise****.'* [Emphasis added.]

The language Sand uses, *"fictitious ethnos of persecutors", "national imaginary",* and *"the exclusive club of the elect"* is telling to be sure, giving us an easy segue into the main themes we shall explore throughout this series.

The subtext of his musings also undermine other recurring shibboleths and canards attendant upon the mythos of the Jewish state and the Jewish identity. Not least of these is Israel's much heralded repute as *"the Middle East's only democracy",* and the absurd proposition that it is the perennially vulnerable 'underdog'; Israel, the hapless victim constantly battling relentlessly hostile forces —almost all being driven by an implacable, psychoneurotic anti-Semitism—intent on wiping it off the face of the planet and with it, every Jewish person! Or some familiar 'riff' on the well-worn, tired, and for many to be sure, *tiresome* theme. Nothing could be more at odds with reality, or further removed from the truth.

As a contradiction in terms, whilst also being at odds with both reality and the fundamental tenets of democracy, the sentiments expressed by Sand were designed to call these well-worn canards and shibboleths into question. Which is to say, other than the country which midwifed its birth (whose own mythological commonalities we shall explore deeper and compare in future 'episodes'), we might pick any modern nation and it would be difficult to identify one with more

fabled 'baggage' than Israel. That is without considering its often subliminally presumed, scripturally ordained, albeit not often successfully challenged, origins.

Said "baggage" attends everything from its murderous, 1948 terrorist inspired foundation in Palestine (what the Palestinians call the "**Nakba**"), to most of the key events and developments that have become embedded in its history since that time, to the ongoing maintenance of its image and reputation (embodied in the "fictitious ethnos", the "national imaginary" as it were), and from there its place and standing within the geopolitical firmament.

This set of beliefs and assumptions so many folks—Jewish *and* non-Jewish—embrace unreservedly, is a varied and variable assortment of fabrications, falsehoods, paradoxes, half-truths, hyperbole, misconceptions, half-baked truisms, double-speak, anomalies, groupthink, self-serving delusions, over-cooked fantasies, and fictional inventions, the overarching *mythos* of which might best be described as a veritable *'kaleidoscope of kidology'*. A shell-game played out behind a smokescreen inside a hall of mirrors as it were. It is fuelled and shaped by everything from:

> 1. *highly sophisticated perception management techniques and the shaping of public opinion toward desired ends (propaganda);*
> 2. *crude censorship, coupled with the denial of freedom of expression and control of the free flow of information, with threats of punishment for non-compliance;*
> 3. *confected umbrage and inflated indignation at any criticism and ruthless vilification and character assassination of those who venture to proffer it;*
> 4. *untrammelled distortion of the historical record, along with the monopolisation—and debasement—of our public and political discourse; and,*
> 5. *the all purpose, one-size fits all weapon of offence & defence—the 'you're an anti-Semite' epithet/label—used with monotonous frequency to stifle dissent.*

To all this Israel—and seemingly so many of its citizens—brings a 'born-to-the-manor' sense of pride and proprietary hubris, a 'haughty spirit' if one likes—a sublime righteousness—not incompatible with the Biblical characterisations of their notional forbears the Pharisees.

> *Author Note.: For his part, arch-Zionist* ***Samuel Untermeyer*** *once described his tribal brethren as "the aristocrats of the world". Although a story for a later, he was one of the prime instigators of the infamous 1933 boycott of Germany by World Jewry when Hitler came to power, an economic sanction which did so much—perhaps more than any other factor—to incite antipathy towards Jews in Germany at the time.—GM*

This "haughty spirit" then embraced an unadulterated *chutzpah,* sanctimony, impudence, ingratitude, and a 'higher sense of purpose' that brooks few moral constraints or entertains even less ethical boundaries or egalitarian precepts. Above all, it seems an inescapable conclusion to draw, that in its most extreme manifestation, Jewishness is characterised by a disdain for The Other, a supremacist *ethnocentrism* that serves as its own bespoke brand of xenophobia. Again, a cursory study of Talmudic precepts (which as noted we will look at in future instalments) renders this an inescapable conclusion.

In the words of **Ilan Pappe**—like Sand another Jewish 'cognitive dissident'—Israel is *'a sinister, destructive war machine'*, fuelled by an *'ideology of chauvinism and exclusion'* that is the basis *'first and foremost for defining the contemporary Jewish identity.'* The end result of such policies *'formulated out of such an ideology'* notes Pappe, *'is an ever-growing [Israeli/Jewish] appetite for control, land and ethnic purity.'* One might also add, "[and for] destruction" as well.

If again for the "diligent students of history", this comes attended by a profound sense of *deja vu*, then perhaps that might give us all pause the next time we go into bat for poor, defenceless, plucky little Israel whenever it's challenged, criticised, or simply taken to task or called to account. This should especially be the case the next time Israel asserts its default—and to all intents *unassailable*—right to defend

itself against a few raggedy-ass **Palestinian** kids with sling-shots, sticks and rocks who have the temerity—and *under international law*, the very *right,* one we don't often hear about in public or political discourse—to stand up for themselves and their people in the only way they know how and with the only means at their disposal.

Perhaps one of the most telling observations that Pappe makes, and one which evidences the absurdity and dis-ingenuity of the Zionist position is this: the number of secular Jews who do not even believe in God, but believe He (he?) nonetheless *'promised them Palestine'*! With much of its overarching narrative engineered and sustained by Israel's *agent provocateurs*, 'hasbara' hacks, and assorted Zionist zealots in the U.S. past and present—in essence the very definition of a 'fifth column'—it is suffused in varying degrees by ill-informed, arm-chair analysis, bespoke presumptions, impressionistic thinking, innumerable logical fallacies, and unquestioning preconceptions.

"We have a right to defend ourselves".

— *Children of the Corrupted Covenant*

According to **Miko Peled**'s interpretation of the **Torah** (the Jewish Bible, or **Pentateuch**), the notion that the Jews 'own' the land of Palestine is a complete misreading of the scriptures. In a recent article, the indefatigable Jewish-American anti-Zionist activist and high profile Palestinian rights campaigner states emphatically that the Holy Land *'belongs to the Almighty who graces it with His holiness'*. The Jewish people were given license to reside there and *'enjoy its grace [only]'* he says, *'**as long as they conducted themselves with righteousness and observed the laws prescribed in the Torah**'*. [Emphasis added.]

Clearly, the early Zionist Zealots who propelled the creation of the Jewish state didn't get the memo from the 'man upstairs'! Or if they did, they interpreted the meaning and intent of this covenant at marked odds with God's wishes, and did so for their own self-serving ends. When the Jewish people strayed from the path of the Torah, Peled notes,

> *'...they incurred the wrath of the Almighty and were expelled from the Holy Land, prohibited from returning until such time as the coming of the Messiah and the return of King David to the throne.'*

Peled—the son of Gen. **Mattei Peled**, one of Israel's 'founding fathers' who himself later renounced the Zionist ideology and became a strong advocate of the Palestinian cause and a sharp critic of Israel—reminds us that Zionism is *'a secular, racist ideology'*, with the founders of the movement caring *'little for the Bible or for Judaism'*. For its part Israel—*'the monstrous creation of that movement'*—is *'an apartheid regime that is committing horrendous crimes'*.

Peled, far from being the only Jew who has questioned the Biblically derived justification for the creation of Israel, has even gone as far as saying that Israel *'doesn't have a right to exist'*, thereby challenging one of the unassailable, sacrosanct pillars of the mythos. Doubtless, this for many might be a bridge too far! This is especially coming from a member of the tribe. More than simply a "self-hating Jew", Peled is presumably held by many in low regard as a heretic as it were of the

highest order! Albeit one challenging moreso the secular ideology of Zionism and not the more 'sacred' theology of Judaism, yet perhaps no less iconoclastic in how they're received by his putative 'co-religionists'.

Beyond Peled's remarks, Israel's unremitting claims that it speaks for, and conducts itself in the name and in the interests of, Jewish people everywhere (again one stresses, however they might be so defined) is well known to those of us with a more nuanced, less romanticised view of the Middle East's 'only democracy'. Insofar as Peled is concerned, Israel[i] and Zionist claims to Palestine '*have nothing to do with Judaism; in fact,* ***the claim that the legitimacy for Zionism can be found in the Bible is completely false.'*** [Emphasis added.]

To underscore this, in a blog piece from 2017, **Benjamin L. Corey** noted that the common evangelical (Zionist) Christian assertion that we must *"support Israel no matter what",* has *'zero basis'* in the Scriptures. For Corey—a theologian, cultural anthropologist, and non-Zionist Christian—this received wisdom is the *'opposite of what the Bible says',* a view echoing Peled's, and from which he avers, an "increasing number of evangelicals" are distancing themselves.

Corey spells out unambiguously four key points in response to the *"you're not a true Christian if you* ***don't*** *stand with Israel"* notion, which he regards as *'nonsense'.* Now space precludes a fuller overview of his rationale, and readers should investigate what he has to for themselves. However it's worth highlighting a few herein, and then perhaps exploring one of these observations in order to serve the broad purpose of our analysis. Which to reiterate is bringing into sharper relief the differences between myth and reality, distinctions which for the most part one's average, garden variety Zionist (Christian or not) isn't keen to see emerge.

> *1. The entire "stand with Israel" theology is based on only one Bible verse;*
>
> *2. The Bible teaches that the true descendants of Abraham are spiritual, not ethnic;*
>
> *3. Not even the prophets in the Bible blindly stood with Israel–including Jesus; and*

> *4. The Bible doesn't command we blindly support people who commit evil acts.*

Even with my own limited knowledge of the Good Book (perhaps now somewhat passed its 'use-by-date'), I did not feel the need to 'fact-check' Corey's assertions; I recall this from my own Christian upbringing and education. Let's take the first of the above, that of the *"stand with Israel"* theology *'based on one verse',* said verse being **Genesis 12:3**: *"I will bless those who bless you and curse those who curse you."*

Per Corey, such was God's promise to *Abraham*—neither biblical Israel *nor* modern Israel existed when this was written. '*This promise [was made] to Abraham',* says he, '*as part of God's covenant with him.*' This being the case, we might fairly suggest that the descendants of Abraham—if we can view today's Jews as such (as we'll see in due course, a big "if")—are the children of a *corrupted* covenant!

To be sure, there seems no shortage of Jewish thinkers and observers both secular and religious, past and present, who either did, or would, think much the same way. Corey's summation—perhaps not coincidentally echoing Douglas Reed's own assessment spelt out at the beginning of this article—is unequivocal:

> '*What the world calls Israel is* ***NOT*** *what the Bible calls Israel. The world is referring to a nation state that was created just a generation ago—the Bible is talking about the people of Abraham, which are a spiritual people who have accepted their king: Jesus. It's not a people group one is born into, but a people group you join by pledging your allegiance to Jesus. So is standing with Israel a biblical concept?* ***No…the stronger biblical case would be standing in opposition to Israel's ungodly behavior****.*' [Emphasis in original.]

Measured against the odds then, we can safely say few campaigns—the one that culminated in the creation of Israel—by any group in history have been so suffused with imperious presumption, hubris, and grandiose, uncompromising ambition. Or we might add, sleight of hand! On its face—even in hindsight—it

seems incomprehensible anyone would conceive of such a gambit much less dedicate themselves so ruthlessly and relentlessly to achieving it. With it seems, very little doubt as to whether they would actually pull it off. It was 'only a matter of perseverance over time'.

Perhaps it is only the architects of the **Tower of Babel** who began their quest with as much presumption, hubris, self-belief, and ambition! And one might add, blind folly! And though some folks may argue the Zionists were far more successful in achieving their goals than the fabled Babel 'bricklayers', others might aver that it's somewhat premature to judge if such success is sustainable. In other words, it's still early days! As he/He/she/She did with the 'Babelites', G-d may yet have the last word with the self-styled, modern day 'Israelites'! Which is to say, their own "Tower of Babel" may still come crumbling down around their ears. In this case, per the "Samson Option" previously mentioned, the only question will be whether they take the rest of us down with them.

As we will see in follow-up instalment, from the outset of the push to establish a Jewish state in this region, such incomprehension—itself subsequently transcended then attended increasingly by fierce resistance to the very notion—applied to many Jewish people, prominent and not so. To these folks such a concept was anathema, heresy even. For non-Jewish folks who opposed this 'unholy grail' crusade, it was simply a very, very bad idea.

For both categories of people, there can be little doubt their worst fears have been realised, their objections vindicated, their opposition now fully justified. This put simply, is a rogue nation, one that does not abide by any rules. Nothing good will come from the international community of nations allowing this situation to continue.

Since its inception, as both history and current events evidence, Israel and its Zionist overlords have demonstrated a ruthless intransigence in seeking dominion over the land it usurped and the subjugation of its indigenous owners and

inhabitants, along with an ill-disguised contempt for international law and world opinion in realising its grand ambitions. That this ruthlessness and determination has surpassed by some measure that which characterised the multi-faceted efforts in its creation is difficult to refute.

For many, the Zionist game-plan was then meant (or more accurately *presumed*) to be over with the creation of Israel! What so many people didn't get then—and still don't get now—is that was simply a dress rehearsal—perhaps only the first act or a 'curtain raiser' of sorts—for something far bigger, more ambitious, far more insidious and earth shattering.

To be sure Douglas Reed thought so. And though he was not the only one who has defined the state of play as such (we'll look at others in future instalments), few perhaps did it as thoroughly, as early and as presciently, and loaded with as much portent, as he did. As to whether any such imagined scenario plays out according to the fabled Biblical narrative in Revelations or on some more temporal plane is anyone's guess.

Either way, something perhaps to contemplate at another time.

Greg Maybury, October 1, 2021.

Greg Maybury is a freelance writer based in Australia. His main areas of interest are American history and politics in general, with a special focus on economic, financial, national security, military, and geopolitical affairs. He has contributed to a diverse range of alternative, independent media (AIM), news and opinion sites, including *OpEd News, The Greanville Post, Consortium News, Information Clearing House (ICH), Dandelion Salad, Global Research, Dissident Voice, OffGuardian, Contra Corner, International Policy Digest, Principia Scientific, The Hampton Institute,* and others.

Type your email... Subscribe

48 Likes · 15 Restacks

Discussion about this post

Comments Restacks

Write a comment...

Greg Maybury 1 Oct 2021

Author

G'day Michael, Many 🙏 for this information. Some of it will be familiar to me, and will need some time to explore the rest further.

LIKE (2) REPLY SHARE

Sol Sön 17 Nov 2021

Liked by Greg Maybury

Fascinating writings . I do not share the religious point of views cause I am strongly opposing any kind of belief. Nevertheless I do share your moral compass, and essentially, your concerns and political point of view .

I would like to invite you to try to read the first unedited instalments of my book “Holy diet” while they are still up for free.

If you can manage to read my pore English, In my book you will find out things which you may have never heard about before, and an explanation of the true roots of that very same evil you are talking about.

I must warn you though, cause it will most likely blow your mind.

If you do are able to read what I wrote, lett me know your thoughts about it

Mean while thanks for sharing and good wishes for a speedy recovery

LIKE (2) REPLY SHARE

22 more comments...

© 2025 Greg Maybury · Privacy · Terms · Collection notice
Substack is the home for great culture